When Being Good is Good… and Bad:
The Dilemma of Asian Americans as the Model Minority in the United States

A Senior Honors Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for graduation
with distinction in Psychology in the undergraduate colleges
of The Ohio State University

by

Marissa W. Lin

The Ohio State University
June 2005

Project Advisor: Professor Marilynn Brewer, Department of Psychology

Abstract

Two experiments addressed the discrepancy of holding Asian Americans as a "model minority," while maintaining negative attitudes towards them. The hypothesis was that individuals feel Asian Americans constitute a realistic threat because they possess too many positive qualities (Ho & Jackson, 2001). The first study surveyed factors related to Asian Americans, including positive stereotypes, negative attitudes, and threats reported by participants, adapted from Stephan et al (2002). The second study used scenarios to place participants in a situation to test the effects of realistic threat in a classroom context. Realistic threat proved to mediate the relationship between positive stereotypes (i.e. too good) and negative attitudes (i.e. threatening) in the first study. Consequently, when being "too good" becomes equivalent with competition, it may predict negative attitudes.

When Being Good is Good… and Bad:

The Dilemma of Asian Americans as the Model Minority in the United States

Historically, racism and prejudice have posed serious problems in the United States, which led to a number of studies, especially concerning Black-White relations (Shelton, 2000). In recent years, researchers have begun to examine the cases of other ethnic minority groups, including the Asian Americans (Ho & Jackson, 2001). Because there are certain stereotypes that each group faces, it is important not to assume that the factors that contribute to stereotypes and the emotions and attitudes individuals hold towards one group will apply to others. Consequently, this study aims to identify the factors that may especially mediate stereotypes, emotions, and attitudes held towards Asian Americans and examine the relationships of these factors.

Prejudice is a prevalent and highly detrimental attitude that influences interracial relationships in the melting pot that is the United States. Researchers have been trying to pinpoint the causal factors for prejudice for many years now. A great deal of this research has focused on the role of stereotypes (Hilton & von Hippel, 1996); for example, Spencer (1998) showed that negative stereotypes against African and Asian Americans are automatically activated when a participant is told they did not do well on an intelligence test. However, some researchers felt that stereotypes alone could not provide an adequate explanation for the production of prejudice. For example, stereotypes did not account for the negative feelings that can be aroused even between members of equal groups, as found in the famous Sherif (1961) Robber Cave study, in which two groups of boys, all white and middle-class, became prejudiced against one another merely through competitive activities.

Continued research in this area led to the Realistic Group Conflict Theory (RGCT). This theory asserts that conflict between groups occurs because they are in direct competition with each other for important resources (Levine & Campbell, 1972). The conflict does not have to be real—competition may be imagined; nor does it have to be a competition that the individual feels personally; as long as his or her group feels threatened, prejudice may result. Some studies have provided support for this theory, including Bobo's (1988) study that revealed that Whites felt that their group was falling behind in comparison to Blacks, resulting in anti-Black prejudice.

One of the more recent models of racial prejudice is the Integrated Threat Model of Prejudice (Stephan, 2002), which includes a feature similar to one found in the RCGT. Stephan (2002) proposes that four proximal factors influence prejudice and four distal factors operate as causal elements for prejudice. He suggests that the proximal factors include: (a) realistic threat, defined as "threats to the economic and political power of the in-group along with threats to the welfare of the in-group and its members;" (b) symbolic threat, the "perceived violation of in-group's symbolic beliefs, (i.e., prescriptive and proscriptive norms and values about society and how society should function);" (c) intergroup anxiety, the "feelings of discomfort that people experience when anticipating or engaging in intergroup interactions;" and (d) negative stereotypes, the "belief that out-group members are hostile, manipulative, unintelligent, unclean, or irresponsible" (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001, p. 252-253). The distal factors include strength of in-group identification, negative out-group contact, history of intergroup conflict, and between-group status differences (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001). Stephan has found support for this theory in several studies with different ethnic groups, including an

assessment of Black-White relations in the United States (Stephan, Boniecki, Ybarra, Bettencourt, Ervin, Jackson, McNatt, & Renfro, 2002).

Using the integrated threat model of prejudice (Stephan 2000), Stephan et al. (2002) distributed questionnaires that included sections on each of the proximal and distal variables to White and Black Americans. The experimenters found that the ethnicity of the minority group, the Blacks, was more salient to them and so the factors related to ethnic identity scored higher for the Blacks than the Whites. Many Blacks reported feeling a threat to their culture from the Whites (a symbolic threat), but may have been influenced by society pressures to assimilate. However, in this study, not only did the ethnic identity factors come out higher for Blacks than for Whites, but all of the scores did. This suggests the possibility that the Whites were responding in a socially desirable way more often than the Blacks. Additionally, in this circumstance, Stephan et al. (2002) introduce another possibility, based on the historical rift between Blacks and Whites in this country: that the Whites reported less intergroup conflict and status differences with Blacks as a way of relieving guilt. The source of this suggested guilt was the idea that Whites may be the cause of the Blacks being disadvantaged.

Despite the fact that the Whites gave these generally positive responses, whatever the reason may have been—social desirability, guilt—they still reported that they felt the Blacks represented a threat to their power, education (as represented by affirmative action), and wealth (Stephan et. al., 2002, p. 1250). These concerns may have been even more salient than usual due to the recent affirmative action debates and court cases. For both groups, feelings of being threatened were even more salient if they had experienced greater negative contact with the other group. The model accounted for greater variance in White attitudes towards Blacks than Black attitudes towards Whites,

suggesting that while the same general types of threats may predict prejudice in minority groups as in the majority group, a more sensitive device may be needed. As Stephan et al. (2002) point out, these other factors may include "being the target of prejudice, racism, discrimination, and oppression may influence the way that the dominant group is perceived in a way that cannot occur for Whites" (p. 1251).

Ho & Jackson (2001) used these ideas of group conflict, prejudice, and competition when they noticed a discrepancy in the stereotypes and attitudes and emotions towards Asian Americans. While Asian Americans are regarded favorably for a minority group (in keeping with the "model minority" image, which suggests that Asian Americans are hard-working and smart), there is also evidence of negative attitudes and emotions toward them. They claimed that Asian Americans are perceived as competitors and, therefore, the model minority image stirs not only feelings of relative deprivation in other groups, but also ones of jealousy and envy. Accordingly, Ho & Jackson (2001) developed the Attitudes Towards Asian Americans scale (ATA) to assess these attitudes. This scale includes questions concerning positive stereotypes, negative stereotypes, emotions, and attitudes (Ho & Jackson, 2001). They found that two sources were contributing to the negative attitudes and emotions expressed towards Asian Americans (Ho & Jackson, 2001). One was that Asian Americans were considered to be *too* good; that is, they were considered too intelligent or too competitive (Ho & Jackson, 2001). The second source was the belief in negative stereotypes of Asian Americans as being unassimilated and antisocial (Ho & Jackson, 2001).

Consequently, there is a blatant contradiction in the labeling of Asian Americans as a "model minority," while maintaining negative attitudes towards them. This leads to the question: "why does this contradiction exist?" To address this question, it is assumed

that there is a basic pervading set of stereotypes concerning Asian Americans familiar to people who live in the United States, even if they do not necessarily subscribe to them. The most common positive one, as mentioned previously, is the model minority image; while the more common negative stereotypes include the image of the unassimilated, non-English speaking, antisocial Asian.

In the current research, the first experiment examined what types of threats, attitudes, and emotions participants actually reported towards Asian Americans through a questionnaire. The second experiment focused on the results of the first study, by narrowing in on realistic threat (competition). Classroom project scenarios were read by the participants to manipulate their feeling of competition against Asian Americans. Of interest in both experiments were the resulting attitudes and emotions reported by the participants towards Asian Americans.

Experiment 1

Experiment 1 examined whether there is a relationship between Stephan's (2002) threats and the Attitudes Towards Asian Americans questionnaire (ATA; Ho & Jackson, 2001). Specifically: does threat mediate the stereotypes and the attitudes and emotions reported by the participant? Prior research indicated that threat may be a mediating factor in prejudice expressed by one group towards another, as seen in Stephen's (2001) study on Blacks and Whites in the United States. However, in that research, there were clearly differing reasons for why one group expressed prejudice towards another, i.e. the Blacks felt threatened by the Whites due to symbolic threat (Stephen 2001). Taken in conjunction with Ho & Jackson's (2001) research, the idea of threat could explain in part the negative stereotypes and attitudes held towards Asian Americans, but this has not yet been tested to see if it relates to the discrepancy identified by Ho & Jackson: that even

those who subscribe to the positive model minority image of Asian Americans may hold negative attitudes and emotions towards them.

In Experiment 1, the participants completed computerized questionnaires that asked them about their attitudes towards Asian Americans and completed scales on the threats they feel from Asian Americans. It was predicted that realistic threat would mediate the relationship between positive stereotypes and negative attitudes and emotions. Negative stereotypes were expected to directly translate into negative attitudes and emotions.

Method

Participants

The 105 subjects were from an introductory psychology class, receiving class credit for their participation. Demographic information was collected to determine the race of each subject. Responses from the 6 Asian American participants were not examined. This left 99 subjects, with 42 male and 57 female.

Measures

Items concerning stereotypes and emotions specific to Asian Americans were from Ho & Jackson (2001), who identified positive and negative traits related to Asian American stereotypes and positive and negative emotions, with emphasis on admiration, hostility, fear, and envy. The validity of the scales were acceptable for both positive (*Chronbach's Alpha*= .87) and negative (*Chronbach's Alpha*= .95) as reported by Ho & Jackson (2001). It was also reported that these scales correlated with similar reports of hostility (negative) or admiration (positive), belief in stereotypes (negative or positive), general attitudes (negative or positive), and social distance (less for negative; greater for positive) (Ho & Jackson, 2001). Replications revealed that reliability was acceptable.

The realistic threat items were modified to be relevant to Asian Americans from a set of items shown to be relevant to realistic threat of African Americans (Stephan, Boniecki, Ybarra, Bettencourt, Ervin, Jackson, McNatt, & Renfro, 2002). The original scale had been used numerous times with good reliability and had acceptable validity for two ethnic groups: African Americans (*Chronbach's Alpha*= .95) and Whites (*Chronbach's Alpha*= .93).

Stereotypes. Seventeen items concerning stereotypes were responded to on a 5-point unipolar scale, from 1 (not at all typical) to 5 (extremely typical). Nine of these traits were negative (antisocial, cold, cunning, deceitful, narrow-minded, nerdy, pushy, selfish, sly) and eight were positive (ambitious, hardworking, intelligent, mathematical, obedient, self-disciplined, serious, traditional). Participants were asked to rate how typical each trait was of Asian Americans.

Emotions. Participants also responded to nineteen emotion items on a 6-point unipolar scale, from 1 (never) to 6 (always), answering the question "How often do you feel the following emotion toward Asian Americans?" Six items were positive and thirteen were negative. The emotions were grouped into four emotion sub-categories: admiration (admiration, curious, encouraged, inspired, proud, respect), hostility (anger, annoyed, disgust, distrust, frustrated, hostile, irritated, resentment), fear (afraid, fearful, threatened), and envy (jealous, envious) (Ho & Jackson, 2001).

Attitudes. Responses to the question, "How much do you like/dislike Asian Americans?" were provided on a 5-point unipolar scale, from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much).

Realistic threat. Twelve items were used to measure the realistic threat reported by participants in regards to Asian Americans. Realistic threat questions included several

areas, such as educational, economic, and political, and were responded to on a 7-point bipolar scale, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). A sample item was, "Asian Americans hold too many positions of power and responsibility in this country."

Procedure

Participants were brought into a room in groups of five to complete a questionnaire in the Media Lab program on the computer. The experimenter, who was half Asian and half Caucasian, briefly explained to them that they would be completing a questionnaire about Asian Americans on the computer and that the questionnaires were completely anonymous, so they should provide their honest responses. The questionnaire itself reemphasized these two points in its introduction page. The participants then completed the ATA, which was randomized within each subscale. Next is the integrated model of prejudice questionnaire, which was, again, randomized within each subscale. Finally, a screen appeared that gave a debriefing and thanked the subjects for their participation.

Results

Reliability was assessed for the composite scales of realistic threat, stereotypes, and emotions. All three proved to be reliable: realistic threat was the highest (*Chronbach's Alpha* = .93), stereotype items were also high (negative stereotype, *Chronbach's Alpha* = .84; positive stereotype, *Chronbach's Alpha* = .87.), and the emotion items were acceptable (admiration = .84, hostility = .95, fear = .78, envy = .81).

Participants experienced admiration the most (3.41 on a 6 point scale), according to mean levels, and fear of Asian Americans the least (1.48 on a 6 point scale). Admiration was strongly correlated with hostility in a negative direction. It was not correlated with fear, but did have a weak positive correlation with envy. Strong positive

correlations were found for fear, envy, and hostility. The most commonly endorsed stereotype was the model-minority stereotype, while the negative stereotype was endorsed the least.

Table 1: Correlations

	Realistic threat	Negative stereotype	Positive stereotype	Attitude	Hostility	Admiration	Fear	Envy
Realistic threat	1.0	.67**	.35**	-.61**	.64**	-.33**	.40**	.27**
Negative stereotype	.67**	1.0	.35**	-.50**	.53**	-.29*	.30**	.17
Positive stereotype	.35**	.35**	1.0	-.22*	.27**	.12	.20*	.28**

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Regression and mediational analyses were conducted to test the prediction that realistic threat was mediating the relationship between the model minority stereotype and negative attitudes. It was found that the hypothesis was supported by the analyses. The model minority stereotype predicted negative attitudes, as shown by its significant relationship to attitudes in a negative direction. When realistic threat was controlled for, this effect became non-significant ($p > .93$), but the effect of realistic threat remained significant ($B = -.603$, $t = -6.47$, $p < .001$). The significant effect of realistic threat as a mediator for the relationship was indicated by a Sobel's test ($z = 2.02$, $p = .043$).

Mediational analyses were also conducted to examine the relationship between the model minority stereotype, realistic threat, and three of the negative emotions: hostility, fear, and envy. It was found that the level of each of these three reported emotions rose as the endorsement of the model minority stereotype increased, indicating that the model minority stereotype was a strong predictor for each of these emotions. Realistic threat was found to be a mediator for all three emotions. This was evidenced when realistic threat was controlled for—the effect of the model minority stereotype as a predictor

became non significant (*p*s > .20). For all three emotions, the effect of realistic threat remained significant: hostility ($B = .628$, $t = 7.00$, $p < .001$), fear ($B = .397$, $t = 3.67$, $p < .001$), and envy ($B = .252$, $t = 2.29$, $p = .024$). Support for realistic threat as a mediator between the model minority stereotype and hostility ($z = 2.56$, $p = .011$) and between the model minority stereotype and fear ($z = 2.26$, $p = .033$) were shown by Sobel's tests. The relationship between the model minority stereotype and envy was shown to be marginally significant by the Sobel's test ($z = 1.70$, $p = .089$). Consequently, realistic threat was shown to mediate the relationship between both positive stereotypes and negative attitudes, and positive stereotypes and three negative emotions.

The effect of realistic threat as a mediator for negative stereotypes and negative attitudes and emotions was then examined. It was found that negative stereotypes were also significantly correlated with negative attitudes and two of the three negative emotions: hostility and fear. Admiration was found to be significantly related to negative stereotypes in a negative direction.

An unexpected finding was that realistic threat acted as a mediator for the relationships between negative stereotypes and negative attitudes and emotions. Negative stereotypes were found to no longer significantly predict attitudes or emotions (*p*s > .17) when realistic threat was controlled for. Its effects remained significant for attitudes ($B = -.603$, $t = -6.44$, $p < .001$), hostility, ($B = .538$, $t = 4.75$, $p < .001$), and fear ($B = .315$, $t = 2.24$, $p = .028$). This was also evidenced by Sobel's tests, which revealed that realistic threat was a significant mediator between negative stereotypes and attitudes ($z = 3.31$, $p < .001$) and between negative stereotypes and hostility ($z = 3.76$, $p < .001$). The Sobel's test also indicated a marginally significant relationship between negative stereotypes and fear ($z = 1.84$, $p = .065$). However, there was no significant or marginal mediation found for

envy (p = .13) or admiration (p = .25). Consequently, not only was it found that realistic threat was a mediator for the positive stereotypes and negative attitudes and emotions, but also served as the mediator for negative stereotypes and negative attitudes and emotions.

Experiment 2

Experiment 1 showed that realistic threat mediated positive stereotypes and negative attitudes and emotions. Experiment 2 then asked students to place themselves in a classroom context to see if this relationship could be manipulated within a setting. Participants read one of four classroom project scenarios:

1) These participants had no partner, no class subject matter, and no ethnic class make-up information provided.
2) These participants were told that they had no partner and that they were in chemistry class, with a class ethnic make-up of 62% Asian American, 29% Euro-American, 5% African-American, and 4% Hispanic American students.
3) These participants were told their partner was Yoshi and that they were in chemistry class, with a class ethnic make-up of 62% Asian American, 29% Euro-American, 5% African-American, and 4% Hispanic American students.
4) These participants were told their partner was Jamal and that they were in chemistry class, with a class ethnic make-up of 62% Asian American, 29% Euro-American, 5% African-American, and 4% Hispanic American students.

The intention was to create different levels of competitiveness, which would be a form of realistic threat, through the use of the different scenarios. The highest threat was

expected to be experienced by the participants partnered with Jamal, and they would, therefore, express the most negative attitudes and emotions towards Asian Americans. Moderate threat was thought to be experienced by the participants with no partner who were provided with information on the ethnic make-up of the class, so they would express more moderate amounts of negative and positive attitudes and emotions. The participants paired with no partner and given no class information were predicted to experience a complete absence of threat, so they would not express either negative nor positive attitudes or emotions towards Asian Americans. Finally, the participants paired with Yoshi were projected to experience no threat and consider him an asset, so they would express the most positive attitudes and emotions towards Asian Americans.

Method

Participants

The 83 subjects were from an introductory psychology class, receiving class credit for their participation. 47 subjects were male and 36 were female. 66 subjects self-identified as White/Caucasian/European American, 8 self-identified as Black/African American, 3 self-identified as Asian/Asian American, 1 self-identified as Hispanic American, 1 self-identified as Multiracial, 1 as Tunisian, 1 as Somalian, and 2 chose not to respond.

Measures

There were four possible scenarios that a participant could receive, and each participant completed only one. The scenarios differed in three major ways. The first difference was that the participants were told that they were either working alone or with a partner. For those who were told that they were working with a partner, they were given only a name as a descriptor of the partner: Yoshi or Jamal. These names were

intended to suggest a particular ethnicity of the partner: Yoshi was meant to be Asian American and Jamal was meant to be African American. Finally, the participants were either not told what class they were in, or they were told that they were in a chemistry class (a class that Asian Americans stereotypically excel in). For those who were told that they were in the chemistry class, the class ethnic make-up was provided: 62% Asian American, 29% Euro-American, 5% African-American, and 4% Hispanic American students.

Sample Scenario. The control scenario read, "You are assigned a project in one of your classes. The professor has said it will be a challenging project. The class is graded on a curve, so you are competing against the rest of the class. You and the rest of your classmates are doing the project alone. The project is worth a significant portion of your grade, so it may determine what you get in the class. It's not a very busy time in the quarter, so you have time to spend on it."

Project Questions. Following the scenarios were a series of questions. Six Likert-type questions asked for participants' assessment of the projects, to which they responded on a 7-point scale. These questions included: "How much do you like doing class projects like these?," "How concerned are you that others will outperform you?," "Do you think you will get an above average grade, an average grade, or a below average grade compared to the rest of the class?," "What grade do you think you will get?," "How well do you think you will do?," and "Was this project set up fairly?"

Partner Questions. Participants who received scenario 3 or 4 also received five Likert-type questions concerning their partner. They responded on a 7-point scale. These questions included: "Would you want this person as your partner on future projects?,"

"Will working with this person help or hurt your grade?," "How well do you and your partner work together?," "How much do you like you partner?," and "How do you feel toward your partner?"

Attitude and Feeling Questions. All participants also completed six Likert-type questions, responding on a 7-point scale. Three of the questions asked "On a scale of 0-100, with 0 being very cold and 100 being very warm, how cold/warm do you feel toward [a certain ethnicity]?" One specified African Americans, another indicated Asian Americans, and the final concerned European Americans. The next three questions asked, "What is your overall attitude toward [a certain ethnicity]?" Again, each question specified one of the aforementioned ethnicities.

Additionally, participants completed the measures used in Experiment 1.

Procedure

The procedure in Experiment 2 was similar to that of Experiment 1, except that the participants were not informed that the study was primarily interested in their attitudes and emotions towards Asian Americans in the situation beforehand.

The questionnaire began with a short introduction that indicated that they would be asked to read a brief scenario and then respond to questions about the situation. They were then provided with the scenario, before proceeding to the follow-up questions concerning the project and, if applicable, the partner, to keep them focused on the classroom situation. A screen then appeared and asked them to complete a series of questions that were "being pre-tested for future experiments," which is the point at which the participants responded to the realistic threat, attitude, and emotion measures. At the end, a screen appeared that gave a debriefing and thanked the subjects for their participation.

Results

One composite score was made from the data, using the twelve questions concerning realistic threat (adapted from Stephan, 2000). This composite was found to be reliable (*Chronbach's Alpha* = .921). An ANOVA was run using this score, but it was found to be insignificant $F(3, 79) = .861$, $p = .465$. The means also failed to show the expected trend ($M_1 = 3.16$, $SD_1 = 1.20$, $M_2 = 2.95$, $SD_2 = 1.46$, $M_3 = 3.34$, $SD_3 = .89$, $M_4 = 3.54$, $SD_4 = .91$). Additionally, there were no significant results for any of the twenty-one emotions (7 positive and 14 negative), nor for the overall attitude towards Asian Americans.

An ANOVA was run using the feeling question ("On a scale of 0-100, with 0 being very cold and 100 being very warm, how cold/warm do you feel toward Asian Americans?) and there was one significant result in this analysis. The overall analysis was not significant $F(3, 79) = 1.633$, $p = .188$, but individual comparisons between the four scenarios revealed that there was a significant difference between scenario 1 (no partner and no class information) and scenario 3 (partnered with Yoshi and class information) of $p = .036$. The means, however, did not follow the expected trend ($M_1 = 60.67$, $SD_1 = 26.61$, $M_2 = 68.83$, $SD_2 = 21.44$, $M_3 = 76.11$, $SD_3 = 20.48$, $M_4 = 64.12$, $SD_4 = 26.13$).

Discussion

The results of Experiment 1 supported the hypothesis, and also made the interesting discovery that not only did realistic threat mediate the relationship between positive stereotypes and attitudes, but also the negative stereotypes and attitudes, which had not been expected. It also proved to be especially significant in regards to emotions such as fear and hostility.

The results of Experiment 2, however, did not support the hypothesis. The means did not even follow the expected pattern in regards to the feelings towards Asian Americans. Despite the fact that the most positive feeling expressed came from the persons partnered with the Asian American, as expected, the other means were completely out of the expected order. Rather than having significantly more negative attitudes and emotions for those partnered with Jamal, the lowest score came from those who had no partner and no class information.

Experiment 2 could have benefited from having a higher power through using a larger sample size. The sample size used (n = 83) was lower than intended due to poor participant response. Additionally, the number of participants who ended up in scenario 1 (30 participants) was a bit greater than the number of participants in the other scenarios: scenario 2—18, scenario 3—18, and scenario 4—17, and having more equal numbers of individuals in each scenario could be more useful. Replicating this study with a larger sample size would therefore be beneficial in having the potential to have a more equal distribution in the cells for better analysis.

Another possibility is that the participants in Experiment 2 did not really experience the realistic threat effects intended in each scenario. Consequently, a better option may be to try to set up an experimental situation in which the participants have greater motivation to feel the realistic threat, which may then support the hypothesis of it functioning as a mediating factor.

An additional factor that could have been at play in either study is the issue of social desirability. While all attempts were made to encourage participants to report their true feelings (for example, in the first study, they were told their data would not be linked to any identifying information, and, in the second study, they were guided to believe it

was about a class and not an ethnic group), there is a possibility that some participants still felt the need to portray themselves as unbiased. Additionally, the main experimenter is half Caucasian and half Taiwanese, and while she made every effort to keep observation of this to a minimum (wearing Ohio State clothing and no Asian jewelry or clothing), this may have influenced the participants' responses if they were particularly observant and guessed her ethnic background.

However, despite the potential flaws in Experiment 2 that made it an unsuccessful study, the results from Experiment 1 show that realistic threat should remain in consideration as a mediating factor for the relationship. Further studies are certainly warranted.

References

Bobo, L. (1988). Attitudes toward the black political movement: Trends, meaning, and effects of racial policy preferences. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 51,* 287-302.

Corenblum, B., & Stephan, W.G. (2001). White Fears and Native Apprehensions: An Integrated Threat Theory Approach to Intergroup Attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 33*(4), 251-268.

Hilton, J. L. & von Hippel, W. (1996). Stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 47,* 237-271.

Ho, C., & Jackson, J.W. (2001). Attitudes Towards Asian Americans: Theory and Measurement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*(8), 1553-1581.

Levine, R.A., & Campbell, D.T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior:* New York: Wiley.

Shelton, J.N. (2000). A Reconceptualization of How We Study Issues of Racial Prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*(4), 374-390.

Sherif, M., Harvey, L.J., White, B.J., Hood, W.R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *The Robbers Cave experiment: Intergroup conflict and cooperation*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Spencer, S.J., Fein, S., Wolfe, C.T., Fong, C., & Dunn, M.A. (1998). Automatic activation of stereotypes: The role of self-image threat. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24,* 1139-1152.

Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K.A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K.S., Jackson, L.A., McNatt, P.S., & Renfro, C. L. (2002). The Role of Threats in the Racial Attitudes of Blacks and Whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(9), 1242-1254.

Appendix A: Stereotype Items

How typical are the following traits of Asians?

Negative traits:

1) Antisocial
2) Cold
3) Cunning
4) Deceitful
5) Narrow-minded
6) Nerdy
7) Pushy
8) Selfish
9) Sly

Positive traits:

1) Ambitious
2) Hardworking
3) Intelligent
4) Mathematical
5) Obedient
6) Self-disciplined
7) Serious
8) Traditional

Appendix B: Emotion Items

How often do you feel the following emotions toward Asian Americans?

Admiration sub-category:

1) Admiration
2) Curious
3) Encouraged
4) Inspired
5) Proud
6) Respect

Hostility sub-category:

1) Anger
2) Annoyed
3) Disgust
4) Distrust
5) Frustrated
6) Hostile
7) Irritated
8) Resentment

Fear sub-category:

1) Afraid
2) Fearful
3) Threatened

Envy sub-category:

1) Jealous
2) Envious

Appendix C: Realistic Threat Items

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. Asian Americans hold too many positions of power and responsibility in this country.
2. Asian Americans dominate American society more than they should.
3. When Asian Americans are in positions of authority, they discriminate against non Asian Americans when making hiring decisions.
4. Education benefits Asian Americans over non Asian Americans more than it should.
5. Asian Americans have more economic power than they deserve in this country.
6. Asian Americans make it harder for non Asian Americans to get into good schools.
7. Asian Americans make it harder for non Asian Americans to get good grades.
8. Asian Americans make it harder for non Asian Americans to get good jobs.
9. Many companies believe Asian Americans are more qualified than non Asian Americans.
10. Asian Americans have more political power than they deserve in this country.
11. Asian Americans make it harder for non Asian Americans to have a good quality of life.
12. The legal system lets Asian Americans get away with more than non Asian Americans.

Appendix D: Scenarios

On the following screen you will read a scenario about a class project. Please imagine yourself in the situation and answer the questions as honestly as possible. Your answers are confidential and anonymous.

Scenarios

1: You are assigned a project in one of your classes. The professor has said it will be a challenging project. The class is graded on a curve, so you are competing against the rest of the class. You and the rest of your classmates are doing the project alone. The project is worth a significant portion of your grade, so it may determine what you get in the class. It's not a very busy time in the quarter, so you have time to spend on it.

2: You are assigned a project in your Chemistry class. Your professor has said the project will be very challenging. The class is graded on a curve, so you are competing against the rest of the class. The class is composed of 62% Asian-American, 29% Euro-American, 5% African-American, and 4% Hispanic American students. You and your classmates are doing the project alone. The project is worth a significant portion of your grade, so it may determine what you get in the class. It's not a very busy time in the quarter, so you have time to spend on it.

3: You are assigned a team project in your Chemistry class. The professor has said the project will be very challenging. The class is graded on a curve, so you are competing against the rest of the class. The class is composed of 62% Asian-American, 29% Euro-American, 5% African-American, and 4% Hispanic American students. The project is worth a significant portion of your grade, so it may determine what you get in the class. It's not a very busy time in the quarter, so you have time to spend on it. Your professor then divides your class into pairs, and you are placed a student named YOSHI. You and Yoshi will work together and receive a single grade for the project based on your combined performance.

4: You are assigned a team project in your Chemistry class. The professor has said the project will be challenging. The class is graded on a curve, so you are competing against the rest of the class. The class is composed of 62% Asian-American, 29% Euro-American, 5% African-American, and 4% Hispanic American students. The project is worth a significant portion of your grade, so it may determine what you get in the class. It's not a very busy time in the quarter, so you have time to spend on it. Your professor then divides your class into pairs, and you are placed with a student named JAMAL. You and Jamal will work together and receive a single grade for the project based on your combined performance.

Project and Partner Items

1. How much do you like doing class projects like these?
2. Would you want this person as your partner on future projects?

3. Will working with this person help or hurt your grade?
4. How well do you and your partner work together?
5. How much do you like your partner?
6. How concerned are you that others will outperform you on the test?
7. Do you think you will get an above average grade, an average grade, or a below average grade compared to the rest of the class?
8. What grade do you think you will get?
9. How well do you think you will do?
10. How do you feel toward your partner?
11. Was this project set up fairly?

Appendix E: Attitude and Feeling Items

Please answer the following questions that we are pre-testing for future experiments.

1) On a scale of 0-100, with 0 being very cold and 100 being very warm, how cold/warm do you feel toward African-Americans?

2) On a scale of 0-100, with 0 being very cold and 100 being very warm, how cold/warm do you feel toward Asian-Americans?

3) On a scale of 0-100, with 0 being very cold and 100 being very warm, how cold/warm do you feel toward European-Americans?

4) What is your overall attitude toward European-Americans? (i.e. Whites)

5) What is your overall attitude toward African-Americans?

6) What is your overall attitude toward Asian Americans?